

### **REMARKS**

Claims 2-11, 13-15 and 18-19 are pending in the application. Claims 2-11 and 13-15 have been rejected. This Amendment amends claims 2-7, 9-10 and 13-15, adds claims 18-19 and cancels claims 1, 12 and 16-17. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants request allowance of the application.

### **SPECIFICATION**

Paragraph [0036] of the published application have been amended to correct a clerical error. No new matter has been added.

### **CLAIM OBJECTION**

Claim 9 has been objected to because the Office Action alleged no explicit definition of a computer-readable medium can be found in the specification. Claim 9 has been amended and support for the amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph 1 of the Detailed Description (i.e., paragraph [0017] of the published application), which contains description about storage devices of computing devices. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 2-4 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claims 1 and 12 have been canceled and new independent claims 18-19 have been added. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements.. Independent claims 10 has been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2-4 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caufield et al. (US Pat. Pub. 2007/0177571) (hereinafter "Caufield"), in view of Chasman

et al. (US Pat. Pub. 2007/0180075) (hereinafter "Chasman"), further in view of Kjellberg et al. (US Pat. Pub. 2003/0084165) (hereinafter "Kjellberg"). Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasman, in view of Caufield, further in view of Kjellberg. Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kjellberg, in view of Chasman. Even under KSR, obviousness is not shown unless the cited art in combination teaches all elements of the pending claims. *See, Ex Parte Wollenhaupt*, BPAI, Appeal No. 2007-3142 (Mar 13, 2008). Here, the claims define elements that are not disclosed by the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **New Claims 18 and 19 Define Over Cited References**

Claims 2-4 and 13-15 have been amended to depend from new independent claims 18 and 19 respectively. Claim 18 recites, in relevant part:

storing an application descriptor for the distributed application, the application descriptor storing **a list of all resources necessary for the distributed application** and **a list of all computing devices participating in the distributed application with respective resources for the distributed application** installed thereon; and ...

Claim 19 contains these identical features. None of the cited references, Caufield, Chasman, and Kjellberg, teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action cited paragraphs [0024], [0026] and [0028] of Caufield as allegedly disclosing storing at least one application descriptor. *See* Office Action, page 4. However, Caufield merely describes user profiles in [0024], rules about device types in [0026] and an user id associating with a device type in [0028] but does not disclose an application descriptor. There is no indication in Caufield of an application descriptor storing "**a list of all resources necessary for the distributed application**" and "**a list of all computing devices participating in the distributed application with respective resources for the distributed application**" as claimed.

Moreover, Chasman and Kjellberg do not cure the deficiency of Caufield. Chasman's disclosure is related to synchronization of objects between a master database and replicated objects in a network. The Office Action does not allege that Chasman discloses storing at least one application descriptor as claimed. Further, Kjellberg is directed to a user-centric session management system. While Kjellberg generally mentions descriptors for objects and applications, it does not teach or suggest a descriptor that stores "**a list of all resources**

**necessary for the distributed application” and “a list of all computing devices participating in the distributed application with respective resources for the distributed application”** as claimed. Therefore, Chasman and Kjellberg, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in the independent claims 18 and 19, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 further recites, in relevant part:

managing all resources for the distributed application and **automatically configuring** the computing device(s) using the application descriptor, including **generating a resource identifier for a respective resource to be installed on a respective computing device** from the application descriptor and an identifier of the respective computing device.

Independent claim 19 contains these identical features. None of Caufield, Chasman and Kjellberg teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action concedes Chasman and Caufield do not teach or suggest using the application descriptor to administrate resources for a distributed software application but alleges that Kjellberg teaches these features. However, as described above, Kjellberg is directed to a user-centric session management system. Kjellberg uses a discovery application to facilitate a user browsing and selecting an object to be downloaded, then forwards a descriptor of the selected to a download application. There is no indication in Kjellberg of “**automatically configuring**” a computing devices using an application descriptor and “**generating a resource identifier for a respective resource to be installed on a respective computing device**” as claimed. Therefore, Chasman, Caufield and Kjellberg, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in the independent claims 18 and 19, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim 5 Defines Over Cited References**

Claim 5 recites, in relevant part:

storing an application descriptor, **the application descriptor describing the association** between the first resource, the second resource, the third resource and, respectively, the mobile device, the middleware server and the backend server, and the application descriptor **maintaining a list of all mobile device(s)** participating in the software application and **resources** that are currently installed on respective mobile device(s) with respect to the software application.

None of the cited references, Caufield, Chasman, and Kjellberg, teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action concedes Chasman does not disclose "storing an application descriptor" as claimed but asserts that Caufield discloses "the application descriptor describing the association between the first resource, the second resource, the third resource and, respectively, the mobile device, the middleware server and the backend server" in paragraphs [0024], [0026] and [0028] of Caufield. See Office Action, page 8. However, as described above, Caufield merely describes user profiles in [0024], rules about device types in [0026] and an user id associating with a device type in [0028], but does not disclose an application descriptor. There is no indication in Caufield of **"the application descriptor describing the association"** between different resources as claimed. Moreover, as described above with respect to claims 18 and 19, Kjellberg does not teach or suggest a descriptor that **"maintains a list of all mobile device(s) ... and resources..."** as claimed. Therefore, Chasman, Caufield and Kjellberg, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in the independent claim 5, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim 9 Defines Over Cited References**

Claim 9 recites, in relevant part:

a **first unique identifier** for representing a software application distributed in the network;  
at least one second unique identifier specifying at least one computing device to participate in the software application, wherein the **first unique identifier maintains a list of unique identifiers** identifying resources that are currently installed on the at least one computing device with respect to the software application; ...

Neither Kjellberg and Chasman teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action asserts that Kjellberg's client software version in paragraph [0024] is an software application ID. However, the Office Action further asserts application descriptor in paragraph [0026] of Kjellberg is associated with application and device profile. It is clear the Office Action cannot identify one equivalent of **"the first unique identifier"** as claimed because Kjellberg does not teach or suggest this feature, and the Office Action has to cite to different elements of Kjellberg for various properties of the claimed feature. Moreover, as described above with respect to claims 18 and 19, Kjellberg does not teach or suggest a first unique identifier that **"maintains a list of unique identifiers"** identifying resources that are currently installed on a computing

device with respect to a distributed software application. Thus, Kjellberg does not teach or suggest a **"first unique identifier maintains a list of unique identifiers"** as claimed. Therefore, Chasman, and Kjellberg, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in the independent claim 9, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 further recites, in relevant part:

at least **one third unique identifier** specifying at least one **resource type**;  
and  
an association between each of the at least one computing device and the at least one resource type, wherein the association is formed by associating the third unique identifier with the second unique identifier, and **the association is used to generate a fourth unique identifier for a resource** to be installed on the at least one computing device.

Neither Kjellberg and Chasman teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action alleges that Kjellberg discloses a third unique identifier specifying at least one resource (e.g., objects and applications) and an association between the third unique identifier and the second unique identifier. However, the **"one third unique identifier"** as claimed specifies "at least one **resource type**," and the association between the third unique identifier and the second unique identifier is **"used to generate a fourth unique identifier for a resource."** There is no indication of generating a fourth unique identifier for a resource in Kjellberg. Accordingly, Kjellberg does not teach or suggest "an association" and **"the association is used to generate a fourth unique identifier for a resource"** as claimed. Further, Chasman does not cure the deficiencies of Kjellberg. Chasman's identifiers only concerns about resolving conflicts but not resource types and resources. There is no disclosure in Chasman about generating a fourth unique identifier as claimed. Therefore, Kjellberg and Chasman, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in the independent claim 9, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim 10 Defines Over Cited References**

Claim 10 recites, in relevant part:

a database for storing at least **one application descriptor**, the at least one application descriptor representing an association between the distributed software application, computing devices participating in the distributed software application and resources to be associated with the computing devices, and wherein the at least one application descriptor **maintains a list of the**

**computing devices and information about resources currently installed**  
on the computing devices with respect to the distributed software application;  
and ...

Neither Kjellberg and Chasman teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action alleges that Kjellberg discloses a database storing at least one application descriptor as claimed. However, in Kjellberg, a user specifies an object or application to be downloaded to a device and the object or application has an associated descriptor. There is no indication in Kjellberg of an application descriptor that **"maintains a list of the computing devices and information about resources currently installed"** as claimed. Chasman does not cure the deficiencies of Kjellberg as Chasman does not teach or suggest any application descriptor. Therefore, Kjellberg and Chasman, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in the independent claim 10, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 11 and 13-15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as described above for their respective independent claims 18, 5, 10 and 19. Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-220-4200 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2008

/Robert L. Hails, Jr./

Robert L. Hails, Jr.

Registration No. 39,702

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005-1257  
Tel.: (202) 220-4200  
Fax.: (202) 220-4201